

**REMARKS**

This is a response to an election of species requirement, the applicants having provisionally elected the species of Figs. 1-15 and identified Claims 1-10 and 21 as reading specifically on that species.

Claim 1 has been amended by broadening it to be generic to both species, and Claim 11 has been made dependent from Claim 1.

37 C.F.R. §1.141(a) reads in relevant part as follows:

... more than one species of an invention, not to exceed a reasonable number, may be specifically claimed in different claims in one national application, provided the application also includes an allowable claim gen-eric to all the claimed species and all the claims to species in excess of one are written in dependent form ...

In the present instance, Claim 1 is generic and Claim 11 has been made dependent from Claim 1. Accordingly, all of these claims and claims dependent from them must be examined in the same application, as required by 37 C.F.R. §1.41(a). The method claims are generic to the species and, accordingly, must also be kept in the present application.

For the above reasons, all of the claims presently in this application should remain and be examined on their merits.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joseph B. Lerch

Registration No.: 26,936

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant